| Interview Summary   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)            |  |
|---|------------------|-------------------------|--|
|   | 10/043,257       | SASAKI ET AL.           |  |
|   | Examiner         | Art Unit                |  |
|   | Steven H. Rao    | 2814                    |  |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  |                  |                         |  |
| (1) Steven H. Rao.  | (3)              |                         |  |
| (2) Donald R. Studebaker ( 32,815).   | (4)              |                         |  |
| Date of Interview: 01 April 2003.   |                  |                         |  |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)⊠ applicant's representative]  |                  |                         |  |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description:  |                  |                         |  |
| Claim(s) discussed: 1-7.9.12-16.23 and 24   |                  |                         |  |
| Identification of prior art discussed: None.  |                  |                         |  |
| Agreement with respect to the claims: f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.  |                  |                         |  |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments. E. Zhe called Mr. Sudpalate to intern thin that the response to the election filled on Describes 30, 2002 was incomplete because claims 3.7.5, 12.16 and 23.24 that the election of claims 2.8 alleged therein. Mr. Studebater current and statest that only claims 1.2 should be examined and has election analy of claims 1.2 only and claims 3.7.9, 12.16 and 23.24 are to be treated as non-elected claims and need not be examined. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims |                  |                         |  |
| allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  |                  |                         |  |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE MITTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.   |                  |                         |  |
|   |                  |                         |  |
|   |                  |                         |  |
|   |                  |                         |  |
|   |                  |                         |  |
|   |                  |                         |  |
|   |                  | 2                       |  |
|   | <i>X</i>         | D                       |  |
| Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.  | Examiner's signa | v<br>ature, if required |  |

U.S. Perent and Trademark Office PTO-413 (Rev. 11- 02) Interview Summary

Paper No 1.